



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2020

by G Rollings BA (Hons) MAUD MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/20/3248942

Land North East Of 31C Oldfield Lane, South Greenford, Middlesex UB6 9LB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by MBNL against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 194184FUL, dated 26 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is the installation of a 20m monopole, 12 no. apertures, equipment cabinets, alongside the removal of the existing 11.7m monopole, 3no. antennas, redundant equipment cabinets and development ancillary thereto.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the Council's description of the site address in the details above, as this provides a more accurate location than the version used on the application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The proposed monopole and accompanying cabinets would be located in a grassed verge between the main carriageway of Oldfield Lane South and a slip road serving residential properties. The verge is laid to grass and slightly raised, with tree planting. The array would be installed on the verge near 58 Oldfield Lane South.
5. The proposal would replace an existing monopole and cabinets to the north of the appeal site, which is on land lower than the site, adjacent to a busy intersection and outside a place of worship and small parade of shops. Although there are a mix of uses in the area, and despite the presence of a museum building and grounds opposite No. 58, the area's character is residential and its appearance typically suburban in nature, particularly closer to the proposal site.
6. Visibility of the site from the road approaches in both directions is assisted by the open nature of the verge, and not wholly shielded by the verge's trees,

which are sporadically spaced and moderate in height. The proposed monopole would be clearly visible and substantially higher than any surrounding building or vegetation. Despite its slender nature, it would appear both obtrusive and incongruous.

7. The proposed cabinets would be arranged in a line adjacent to the monopole and would outnumber those in the current location. By their number they too would also appear out of place within the otherwise domestic environment. As well as views along Oldfield Lane South, outward views from the properties at No. 58 and its neighbours would be harmed.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with the Council's *Development Management Development Plan Document* (2013) (DPD) Policies 7.4 and 7B, which together require development to complement existing built form with positive visual impact, amongst other considerations. I have disregarded the Council's reference to DPD Policy 7.21 as this does not appear to exist. The applicable policies are consistent with Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.21 of *The London Plan* (2016), with similar aims.

Other considerations

9. There is a need for this form of installation within the area, and this has positive weighting on my decision. I have also taken account of the absence of objections and any other harm identified by the appellant, but these considerations do not outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Rollings

INSPECTOR